121 The exclusive emphasis on marriage as a causative factor
114 in kinship terminology, found both in Rivers and Aginsky though in different form, appears to be losing ground steadily; cf. the excellent studies by Tax, Eggan, McAllister, Opler, and Gilbert (in Eggan, 1937) and Opler (1937).

121 No use has been made of the terms "classificatory" and
128 "descriptive", each of which has acquired so wide a range of
60 connotations as to have lost all preciseness. The term "analytical" is used in its basic linguistic sense, e.g. "father's brother" is an analytical term, whereas "uncle" is a primary term. Note that a term may be only partly analytical, e.g. "uncle's son", where the fully analytical term would be "father's brother's son" or "mother's brother's son".

Three types of terminological equations are distinguished, as follows:

1. Categorical equation: equation of members of the two different categories of kin (consanguineal and affinal), e.g. "mother's brother" = "father-in-law".

2. Lineal equation: equation of members of two different lines of descent, e.g. "brother" = "father's sister's son", "son" = "brother's son".

3. Serial equation: equation of members of two different generations, e.g. "son" = "grandson".

These terms are to be regarded as convenient tags of some use in describing patterns of nomenclature, e.g. the Omaha and Crow types are characterized by serial equations in the cross collateral lines. The equation may rest on the extension

121 of a term through analogy or teknonymy, e.g. "grandfather" =
128 "father-in-law" (teknonymy) or on the merging of the referents,
601 e.g. "mother's brother" = "father-in-law" in a group practising cross-cousin marriage. One's explanation of a given system of nomenclature depends in large measure on his analysis of these factors, and one must guard against a premature assumption in either direction. Other equation categories can be established, e.g. the equation of elder and younger siblings, but those cited above have proved to be the most useful.

A final word remains to be said with regard to the system of notation employed. For each language considered in detail, a table of terms is drawn up, with those referring to female kin on the left, those referring to male kin on the right, and those without sex specification (neuter) in the center. This simple arrangement permits of rapid inspection of the table, and is more convenient than the charts of which kinship theorists are so fond. In the notation itself an attempt has been made to get away from the "bastard algebra of kinship", to use Malinowski's phrase (p. 19). Primary English terms are represented by capital letters, and English categorical terms by small letters. Since terms such as "aunt", "uncle", and "cousin" are often found in our sources, these have been retained in our notation. The letter N is used for "nephew, niece" (i.e. neuter), Ne for "nephew", Ni for "niece", and the cousin terms are formed analogically, viz. C "cousin (neuter)", Ce "cousin (male)", Ci "cousin (female)". Cf. also the parallelism in Si "sister" (S "son").

Kinship Notation

121 A aunt
128 B brother
197 C cousin
601 Ce cousin (male)
Ci cousin (female)
Ch child
D daughter
(ds) (different sex from speaker's)
F father
g grand-
l -in-law
M mother
N nephew or niece
Ne nephew
Ni niece
(os) (older than speaker)
p parallel
P parent
S son
Sb sibling
Si sister
Sp spouse
(ss) (same sex as speaker's)
U uncle
x cross
(ys) (younger than speaker)

Bibliography

113 Aginsky, B. W.

1935a. Kinship Systems and the Forms of Marriage. MAAA 45.

1935b. The Mechanics of Kinship. AA 37. 450-57.

1938. Time Levels in Societal Analysis. AA 41. 416-32.

Davis, K. and Warner, L.

1937. Structural Analysis of Kinship. AA 39. 291-313.

Eggan, Fred (ed.)

1937. Social Anthropology of North American Tribes. Chicago.

193 fixed word order: subject + object + verb. The verbal prefix apparatus, which is especially prominent in Tibetan and Kachin, consisted of "subjective" prefixes m-, b-, and "directive" prefixes d-, g-, r-, l-, s-. The s- prefix often appears as a true causative morpheme, as in Kachin in the form ša, dža, e.g. bra "to be scattered", ša-bra "to scatter"; k'rit "to fear", dža-k'rit "to frighten", and in Burmese, in which the initial of the transitive form has been aspirated by the loss of prefixed s-, e.g. pran "to be full", p'raṅ "to fill"; lwat "to be free", hlwat "to set free". Prefixed m- is "stative" (neutral), as in Tib. mnam-pa "to smell, stink", mt'o-ba "to be high", often with reflexive force, as in Tib. mnab-pa "to put on garments, dress oneself". This prefix seems to represent an ancient demonstrative pronoun, which still functions independently in Meithei (Manipuri) and can be traced elsewhere. It often imparts substantival value, e.g. *m-šin (Tib. mtš'in) "liver" "its-bitter (šin)-part" (see the discussion in Benedict, 1939), Kachin pyen "to fly", ma-pyen "wings" < "its-flying", rut "to rub", ma-rut "a grater" < "its-rubbing". In many instances prefixes occuring with substantival forms cannot be analyzed, e.g. *r-mei "tail", *d-gu "9", while occasionally there is fluctuation in prefix usage, e.g. *l-nga or *b-nga "5".

●601 193 The existence of the m- pronominal prefix discussed above is of some importance in the analysis of kinship terms in Tibeto-Burman. Kinship terms, like words for parts of the

body, are especially susceptible to prefixation of this type. Thus Meithei has ma-pa "father", ma-ma "mother" just as it has ma-sa "body", ma-mei "tail", ma-hau "fat", ma-hei "fruit", etc. The most widespread prefix of this type is the prefix a-, as in Tib. ʾa-pʾa "father", ʾa-ma "mother", Lepcha a-bo "father", a-mo "mother", Kachin a-wa "father", a-nu " mother", Burmese a-pʾa "father, a-maʾ "mother". As Laufer has shown, this a- prefix usage extends even into Chinese. In Tibetan this prefix is used only with kinship terms, but in Kachin, Burmese, and some of the Kukish languages it has retained its old pronominal function in its use with words for parts of the body, e.g. Southern Chin a-miʾ "eye", a-ho "tooth" along with a-po "father", a-nü "mother", and Lhota Naga o-kʾa "hand", o-pok "belly" along with o-po "father, o-pvü "mother" (Lhota o < a). Wolfenden (1929, pp. 177 and ff.) sought to distinguish between pronominal and non-pronominal usages of this prefix, but failed to note its use with parts of the body in Kachin (e.g. a-mun "hair of the body", a-nu "brain") and in Burmese (e.g. a-mweˀ "hair of the body", a-mriˀ "tail"), hence his argument must be discarded in toto. A third prefix of pronominal origin, ʔa- or ka-, is also used with relationship terms, e.g. Kachin ka-wa "(his) father" along with n-wa "(your) father" and a-wa "(its) father" and wa "father", Thado (Khongzai dialect) ka-pa "father, ka-nu "mother". In the separate discussions that follow, pronominal prefixes of this type will be enclosed within parentheses, e.g. Tib. (ʾa-)pʾa "father".

601 193 In striking contrast to this rather elaborate prefix apparatus Tibeto-Burman shows almost no true morphological suffixation. A characteristic "final dental morphology", however, appears in Tibetan, Kachin and elsewhere and undoubtedly must be postulated for the parent speech. In this series Tibetan has -n, -d, and -s, the latter in some instances derived from -ds. Cf. the following examples: Tib. za-ba, gza-ba "to eat", gzan-pa "to eat, devour, gnaw", bzan "food of animals, pasturage", zan "pap, fodder", zas "food, nourishment", and Kachin sa "to eat", sat "boiled rice", i.e. "food"; Tib. bgo-ba "to put on clothes", gon-pa "to put on clothes; clothing", gos "garment"; Tib. dro-ba "to be warm, warm, warmth", dro, dros "the hot part of the day", dros-pa "heated", dron-mo "warm", drod "warmth, heat". As indicated by the above series, these derivatives in -n, -d, -s are often substantival, the typical formation being of the type na-ba "to be ill", nad "disease". The connection between the verbal root and the derived form with final dental is not always clear, especially in languages in which this morphology no longer functions, e.g. Burmese na "to be ill", nat "demon" < "spirit of disease" (see the discussion in Benedict, 1939). The importance of this morphology in connection with kinship terminology will be made clear in the discussion of the Tibetan system.

197 The classification of the Tibeto-Burman languages presents a number of serious problems which admit of no solution at the present time. The general picture is much

23:Benedict E-5 (no date) 1941 ALl Southeast Asia ALl
Sino-Tibetan Border Peoples AE3

17. Review of Tibeto-Burman

SA
121
●601
ST
121
601

The present section has been written with a two-fold view in mind, viz. a provisional reconstruction of the archaic Tibeto-Burman kinship nomenclature and a synthesis of material bearing on the general problem of the factors that have produced changes in this archaic system. It is of course impossible to realize either of these goals in any complete sense. The reconstruction of a set of kinship terms differs very little from the reconstruction of any other group of terms, e.g. those for animals. In each case certain phonetic generalizations must be followed, and in each case original meanings must be assigned to roots on the basis of a series of fluctuating connotations. The difficult problem of "partial equations", in which a given root has a limited distribution, arises here precisely as in any other linguistic field (for a good recent discussion, vide Scherer, 1941). A distinction between the two types of reconstruction can be drawn, however, in the fact that kinship terms constitute a definite system whereas those for animals, parts of the body, or the like, do not constitute such a system. It is fairly evident that, within kinship nomenclature, a semantic shift at one point is likely to be reflected at another, or, in sociological terms, a single factor, e.g. cross-cousin marriage, is likely to produce a series of interrelated changes, whereas this in general does not hold true within other linguistic spheres. In this respect a kinship nomenclature might be compared with

SA 121 ●601 ST 121 601

a phonemic system, in which similar integration appears. The point is not worth elaborating, since the fact that a kinship terminology does constitute a system hardly relieves us of the task of investigating each element of that system, both independently and correlatively.

In any piece of historical reconstruction, linguistic or other, the natural tendency is to make the prototype unduly complex. The writer has often been struck by the complexities shown by hypothetical reconstructed languages as compared with their actual living descendants, as though linguistic evolution always proceeded in the direction of simplification. The number of distinct roots assigned to these reconstructed languages is sometimes of staggering magnitude, and no ingenuity is spared in augmenting this lexicographical harvest. In the present study it would be easy to reconstruct an archaic nomenclature with two or more terms for most relationships, yet such a procedure patently would be futile. It is far better to determine, firstly, which elements are relatively certain, and, secondly, which elements are based largely on "partial equations" and must thus be held in reserve until a basic framework has been set up. Nine roots, eight of which are

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

applied to consanguineal relatives, stand out in our complete Tibeto-Burman series as culled from the foregoing review. These roots constitute the following systems

SA
● 601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

Tibeto-Burman Terms

*p'i gV		*p'u gF
*m N		*p'a F
*ni FN1		*k'u KB
	*ŋaa yOb	
	*ŋa Ch	
		*mak Sl

The forms given above can be accepted with some confidence as fair approximations of the archaic Tibeto-Burman roots. All except the affixal term *mak have vocalic finals, and it was on the basis of finals or "rhymes" (medial vowel + final consonant), especially of vocalic finals, that Shafer and the writer were able to work out the main features of Tibeto-Burman phonology. Earlier writers had in general attacked the problem from the most difficult angle, that of initials and tones. Thus, no less a scholar than Laufer is responsible for the following absurd dictum:

> Prefixes as well as final consonants....are of minor importance in the comparative study of Indo-Chinese languages.... the staff of comparison remains the initial consonant and the tone conditioned by it. (TP 17, p. 115).

Prefixes have shown to be of basic importance, while both the initials and the tones have been so influenced by the prefixes that our analysis of them still lags far behind our analysis of the finals. In the above set of terms, however, the only problems in re initials concern the aspiration or lack of aspiration, voicing or unvoicing, of the stop initials of *p'i, *p'u, *p'a, and *k'u. Nukish has *pi gV and *pu gF,

SA 6001 193 197 ST 6001 193 197

but initial aspiration is not well preserved in this group. Mikir has p'i gK, p'u gF, hm < *k'u MB, but po < *pa F. Meithei, which ordinarily preserves aspiration, has pu gF, pa F, and hm F1 (< MB). Kachin has hm HF (< MB) rather than the anticipated *k'u, and Burmese has (ste-)hui oS rather than *k'ui. Tibetan has p'yi gL, p'a F, and k'u FB (< MB), while both Tibetan and Kachin have p'u oS (< gF). It may be that one or more of these roots had a sonant rather than a surd initial. Initial g-, a rare element in our comparative material, is perhaps indicated for the MB root (*gu ~ *g'u), but at present nothing definite can be said on this point.

Only one of the above terms is uncertain as regards final, viz. *ni FSi. Classical Tibetan has no rather than *ni, and Meithei has nen~ne rather than *ni, both of which point to an archaic form *nei rather than *ni. The weight of evidence, however, speaks in favor of the reconstruction *ni, from which *nei may have been developed as a doublet root; cf. Kukish *nau ySh, *nou "young, tender", which tend to be confused (vide pt. 15).

The basic gF terms *p'i and *p'u are found together in Garish, Mikir, Meithei, Mru, Kukish, and Durmish-Lolcish (but p'e^3 gqF < *p'i in Burmese itself, which has a new term [p'wa^3] for gK). The root *p'i is further retained in its basic meaning in Tibetan, Khamauri (perhaps Tibetan loan-word), Bahing, and Vayu, while Chang has retained it in the meaning "gF". In northern TB groups the root *p'u has been applied

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

to oB, viz. in Tibetan, Limbu, Newari (only in combination), Digaro, and Kachin. This semantic interchange also appears in Burmish-Loloish, viz. Moso p'u gF, bu oB, Nyi bu gF, bu oB. The interplay of surd and sonant initials in these Moso and Nyi forms indicates that doublets are involved. In Barish the root *p'i gN (in the form bi) has been applied to oSi, both in the Bodo-Dimasa and Garo divisions of this group, and also retained in its basic meaning. It is clear that these usages are connected with the especial position held by oSb, and that the gP terms function here simply as honorifics. Other TB roots, less widely distributed than the above, show the same type of semantic shift (vide infra). In societies with a patrilineal bias it is only natural that the role of oB should be of more significance than that of oSi, thus perhaps accounting for the relative stability of *p'i as compared with *p'u. It can hardly be without significance that in the single matrilineal group encountered (Barish) the term *p'i gN should have been applied to oSi, in contrast to all other TB groups.

Of the two basic P terms *p'a F and *ma M, the former is the most widely distributed and shows fewer variations. The following groups have this root (*p'a): Tibetan, Kanauri, Byangsi, Bahing, Vayu, Newari, Lepcha, Miri, Dhimal, Burmish-Loloish, Konyak, Barish, Mikir, Meithei, Mru, and Kukish. This root commonly appears as a masculine affix, but no instance of a transference to "oB" has been uncovered. The

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

root *ma M appears in Tibetan, Kanauri, Bahing, Vayu, Newari, Lepcha, Dhimal, Burmish-Lolcish, Barish, and Meithei. In Burmese itself it is retained only in the terms ma' SI and a-ma' "feminine suffix", and in the closely-related Maru only in the meaning "MSi". Tru has preserved this root only in the feminine suffix -ma. A transference to the meaning "oSi" is found in the contiguous North Assam groups Dafla and Aka. In Kachin and the extensive Kukish group this root appears to have vanished without leaving a trace.

The two PSb terms *ni and *k'u are also unequally represented in Tibeto-Burman. The root *ni FBi is of almost universal occurrence. In its basic meaning it appears in Tibetan, Gyarung, Kanauri, Thebor, Vayu, Newari, Abor-Miri, Mung, Burmish-Lolcish (but not in Burmese itself), Konyak, Barish, Mikir, Meithei, and Kukish. Kachin has retained it only in the affinal meaning "WM". Aka, if we can trust our inadequate sources, has applied this root to M, while Limbu has applied it to oSi. Replacement by the term for "oSi" is seen in Dafla, Sho, Changki (Ao), and probably Kadu, while Mongsen (Ao) shows replacement by the term for "oSb". The Dafla material indicates that this is an analytical development ("oSi of F"). Lepcha equates FBi with WBi in the term nyu ~ nyo, applied to female relatives in the uterine line. This unusual equation also appears in Bahing, which has mo-mo MBi,FSi (from mo < *ma M), and po-po FB (from po < *pa F), yet has ku-ku MB. Distinct terms have been

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

developed in Kachin (moi), which preserves *ni as an affinal term (WH), and in Burmese (yi^3), but *ni is retained in the closely related Maru. The Dimasa term do-de FBi (bo-de MB) is likewise distinct.

The much more restricted root *k'u MB is found in its primary meaning in Bahing, Vayu, Abor-Miri, Dafla, Digaro, Mung, Mikir, and Ao. Tibetan has k'u FB, but skud < *k'u Fl,Bl. Himalayish and Lepcha also have k'u FB, probably because of Tibetan influence. Kachin, Meithei, Ntenyi Rengma, and Anyo Rengma have retained the term in the affinal meaning "HF" (Meithei Fl), and Sema in the affinal meaning "FSiH". Chang (Konyak) has the form ko MB, which cannot with certainty be connected with this root. In the Burmish-Lolo1sh group we can cite only Burmese kui "prefix used with names of persons older or of higher rank than the speaker, or politely of his equals" (ats-kui oB), Akha a-kǒ B, Ahi kǒ-pu-li yBiH, and Moso a-gu Bl. The Moso usage is paralleled in the Barish group, where we find Bodo gu-mai, Garo gu-ma Bi. This root cannot be traced in the Kuki languages proper, yet can be reconstructed for Kukish on the basis of the Naga terms (supra), and for Kukie in general on the basis of the Mikir and Meithei terms.

The root *nau yBb, occasionally applied either to yB or yBi alone, also to Ch, is well represented in Tibeto-Burman. It appears in the following groups: Tibetan (nu ∼ no), Byangsi (yB), Limbu, Lepcha, Aka, Kachin, Konyak, Barish (yBi), Meithei, Mru (yB), and Kukish (yBb ∼ Ch). The most conspicuous gaps are those in Abor-Miri-Dafla, Mung, and Burmish-Lololsh.

23:Benedict E-5 (no date) 1941 ALl Southeast Asia ALl
Sino-Tibetan Border Peoples AE3

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

The eighth and last of the basic consanguineal terms is *sa Ch, which is found in Tsangla, Nagari, Miju, Aka, Kachin, Kadu, Nung (za-ai D), Pyu, Burmish-Lolo1sh, Konyak, Barish, Mikir, Meithei, Mru, and Kukish (rarely used for ySb, as in Poeron and Kyow). Lepcha has a-so < *sa ggF, a-son gCh (with suffixed -n). This root is conspicuously absent in Tibetan and its dialects (but present in Tsangla, a Bodish language), Himalayish, and Kiranti, i.e. the northern or northwestern band of Tibeto-Burman languages, as well as in the Abor-Miri-Dafla group.

The affinal term *mak Sl appears in Tibetan, Lepcha (< *smak), Dhimal (< *smak), Miri, Kachin (da-ma < *da-mak), Burmese (sa-mak), Meithei, Mru, and Kukish, with an additional uncertain occurrence in Byangsi. In view of our generally inadequate data on affinal nomenclatures (e.g. we do not have the term for "Sl" in Nung, where we should expect to find this root), the widespread distribution of this root is of increased significance. It would appear that the root is lacking in Himalayish, Mikir, Konyak, and Barish.

The above set of basic terms is supplemented by a series of roots of restricted distribution. Some of these serve mainly as replacements for the basic roots, while others are functionally more independent. Since our set of basic terms is not complete, we must assume that some of these roots represent archaic Tibeto-Burman elements, but this point is best discussed after the various secondary roots have been analyzed.

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

The gP roots *p'i gH and *p'u gF have no serious rivals in Tibeto-Burman. A curious link between Tibetan and Southern Naki is suggested by the following set of terms: Tib. po ~ spo gF (literary or dialectical), mo gH (literary), and Sho a-pŏ ~ a-pŏk gF, Chinbon kh-mo gH, Yindu kn-mo gF. A possible root *si is indicated by Balti as-si (= a-si) gF, Bunq a-si gH, Khami a-um-si gF, and Kadu a-si MSi (i-si "woman"), Yindu kn-si FSi, Sho a-si FSi, oSi (cf. the roots *ta and *tsi, infra). In general, gP terms show more variation than do P terms; thus, Kachin has developed distinct terms for both gH (woi) and gF (ji), and note forms such as Byangsi ti-ti gF, Bahing and Vayu ki-ki gF.

The most conspicuous of the secondary P roots is *nu H, which appears in Kachin, Miju, Sak, Konyak, Nukish, and perhaps Nikir and Meithei (in combination). The root *pui "mother, female" is restricted to Nikir and Nukish. The Nukish feminine affix *la, used especially of young females, seems to have given rise to Mongsen-Changki (Ao) a-la H, Ntenyi Rongma a-la ggH, Anyo Rongma a-la gH, and cf. Byangsi la-la gH, Sunwari a-la Si. The same root (*la) appears in Kachin, Burmish-Lolcish, and elsewhere as a masculine affix. The Tibeto-Burman root *wa "male" serves to explain both Duman and Kachin wa, Kadu a-wa, Garo (dialects of A type) a-wa F (Mechang and Ramsang wa F probably through Kachin influence), Aka au < *a-wa F, Burmese wa-hri[3] "term of address to old man" (Arakanese dialect), and Lepcha a-vo < *wa, Meithei (ma-)wa, Nukish wa H; cf. also Digaro ma-wa "male",

SA Bhimal -wa 'masculine suffix", Bodo hwa "male". Some of
● 601 these forms, however, may have resulted from a phonetic
193 development from *p'a F (probably via *ba).
197
ST A root *mei or *me appears sporadically in Tibeto-Burman,
601 sometimes with a dental suffix. This root is parallel to,
193 but distinct from, TB *ma M. The following forms belong here:
197 Tibetan -med "woman" (in bud-med < *bu-med, paralleling
bu-smad), Gyarung to-mi ~ to-me "woman", Kanauri -med (suffix
in "D" and "Ml"), Chamba Lahuli me "bitch", Limbu met W,
Lepcha a-mit "woman", Hadu a-me M, Mung a-me M (cf. Mung
a-p'e F), Burmese a-mi^{3} ~ a-me M, and Garo me-cik "woman,
wife". Note also the series formed by Burmese sa-mi^{3}, Aka
sa-mi, Mung za-mi D (from *ma Ch). Garo gu-me Bl, Mikir
me SiH correspond phonetically but can scarcely be fitted
in otherwise.

In addition to the above, there are traces of a set of
roots *ya and *yu, both applied to female relatives. The
former is better attested than the latter; cf. Himalayish
(Manchati, Kanashi, Chamba Lahuli) ya M, Abor-Miri and Dafla
yo < *ya gM (but in Pagri Miri used for "M" in address),
Tableng (Konyak group) ya M, Naga *ya M, also Kanauri yas,
Rai (Kiranti) me-ya, Burmese ma-ya^{3} W, Digaro mi-ya "woman",
ha-mi-ya W. The root *yu is represented only by Kanauri
yu-med, Khambu (Kiranti) yuh, Lepcha a-yu W, Lepcha tA-yu
"woman", and perhaps Tibetan yu-mo "female of a stag".

Nothing has yet been said of o5b terms, which show a
wide variety of forms contrasting with the standard y5b root (*nau)

SA ●601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

Much of the material in this connection is of a scattered nature from which it is difficult to draw any conclusions. Thus, Byangsi hye, Dahing ye oB, Meithei ye-ee oB, Chawte (Old Kuki) a-ye B, si-ye oSi, and Khami ye-et ~ ye-i oB suggest an archaic root *ye oB, yet this same element appears in another setting (supra). Burmese ats-kui < *ik-kui oB, Mikir ik oB lack cognates elsewhere, as do Maru pai oSi, Chonbok pai oSi(ws), unless the latter pair be connected with Burmese a-pai "maden" and perhaps Mikir pei ~ pe M. The characteristic Kukish root u oSb (Central, Northern, and Old Kuki groups only) does not appear elsewhere in this setting, yet appears to be identical to Shö ŭ M, Taungthu u W, Mru u M, and Burmese u^3 MB (prefixed to names of men considerably older than the speaker), perhaps also Tanghkhul a-wŏ gF, MB.

Three or four roots, however, stand out more prominently than the above lot and deserve especial consideration. Tibetan e'e oSi(ws) has been compared with Himalayish *e'e "female" as represented by Kanauri e'ets "female, woman", Kanashi e'ets W (with diminutive suffix -ts) and with the Byangsi-Chaudangsi term e'e xC, as well as with Johar a-ee F. The above terms all point to a TB root *e'ei. A similar root, but apparently with unaspirated initial (*cei), is represented by Konyak jei ~ cei oSb ~ oB, Meithei ee oSi, Tanghkhul cei oSb, Western Kuki *cei oSb, Anyo Rengma a-ee oSb. The Tibetan term appears to be etymologically connected with the word e'e-ba "great", from which the respectful term gsen-po oB has been developed.

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

A root *-na cSi appears in Kuruai, Vayu, Kachin, Andro, and Konyak, while the Abors and Abor-Miri-Dafla groups have *-na N, and Lakher has the vocative term i-na N. Tibetan mna Dl perhaps also belongs here, though it may be of periphrastic origin (< mna "oath").

The Tibeto-Burman root *-ta (often in the form da) is consistently applied to relatives older than Ego, if one regards the Kuki-Vayu root *-ta CR as of distinct origin. The following terms can be grouped with this root: Tibetan 'a-ta F (dialectical), cB (Eastern Tibet), Tsangla a-ta cB, Gyarung a-ta-ta F, Johar a-ta cSi, Byangsi ta-ta cSi, Newari ta-ta cNi, Miri and Dafla a-te < *-ta gF, Digaro ta gF, da cB, Burmese $t'a^{3}$-$t'a^{3}$ F (dialectical), Akha a-ta F, Independent Lolo a-da F, Sho a-ta cB, Chinbon (ka-)t'a cB, Lhota a-ta cSb, Changki (Ao) a-ta FSi,cSi, Naong Rongsa a-da FoB. Doublet forms are found only in Digaro (ta gF, da cB). Unlike *-p'u gF,cB this root has also been applied to F in some languages (Tibetan, Gyarung, Burmese, Akha). Desgodins describes the Tibetan term 'a-ta as a "children's word" (vox puerorum), and in Independent Lolo a distinction is made between a-ta F (used by children) and a-bu ~ a-bo F (used by adults).

Kuruai te-te gF, a-te cB are clearly of a type paralleling that described above. The suggested TB root is *-tei, with which can be grouped Byangsi te-te xC(ss), Dafla tĕ-tĕ FyB,cB (in different sources), Kadu a-te cSi, Banpara a-tai cB, Mikir te cSi(wa), Maithei i-tei-ma cSil, and Kru a-tai BK.

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

An objection might be raised to the above discussion on the ground that forms such as *na, *ta, and *tsi (te) are of "nursery word" type and should not be regarded as representing actual TB roots. The writer himself originally ascribed to this general point of view, but the collection of material on which this study is based has led him to discard it. Thus, ta F appears both in the West Tibetan dialects (Balti, Purik) and in the nomad dialects of Eastern Tibet, as well as in the aberrant Gyarung language, whence we can safely infer a Bodish root *ta F. The term na oSi appears in five distinct languages representing two different foci (Murmi-Vayu and Kachin-Andro-Konyak), and na N in two isolated groups (Almora and Abor-Miri-Dafla). Distributions of this type are scattered, to be sure, yet not entirely random. The cluster of connotations (gP, P, oSb) around these roots is also not without significance.

The majority of the terms for Sb(ds) are of limited distribution. Tibetan sring-mo Si(ms), dialectically used for ySi, appears also in Himalayish (Si) and Byangsi (ySi), with an additional possible occurrence in Dhimal-Toto (Si). Kachin jan < *jar Si(ms), often used for ySi, is directly related to Kukish *dzar Si(ms), which in Western Kuki is used for ySi, and to Maithei i-zel ~ i-zan ySi, Kadu zan, Sengmai zil ySi. Kachin yung B(ws) has been compared with the Garo-Dimasa root *yung yB. The tendency to equate Sb(ds) with ySb is reflected in all three roots.

The roots *nau ySb and *za Ch are of almost universal occurrence and have no serious rivals. The former is

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

conspicuously absent in Burmish-Lolo1sh, which has a root *nyi (ní), comparable with Lepcha nyi-t'i gCh. A root *nga is suggested by Murmi and Gurung a-nga ySi, Miri ăng-ă ySb, Dafla ang-a Ch, Naga *nga Ch. Isolated roots *a Ch and *ka Ch are represented by Digaro a, Abor-Miri e < a Ch, and Newari ha, Abor-Miri ko < *ka Ch, respectively.

It will be noted that the set of basic terms presented above lacks all collateral terms as well as a gCh term. Our data on collateral terms are incomplete for many groups, so that negative evidence here is of relatively little value, but it would seem that no root or roots for xC have been developed. The only root of any extension here is *ning, which appears in Kachin (xCe,ws), Chang (xC), Mikir BW(ws), and perhaps Garo (Sbl). The Mikir and Garo affinal meanings can be explained in terms of cross-cousin marriage.

Three or perhaps four TB roots show a tendency to equate H with gCh. Tibetan ts'a Ne (probably SiS,ms),gCh furnishes an example of this tendency. Bahing and Newari have this root (*ts'a) in the meaning "gS", but in the Kiranti languages in general it is used for "S" (see the discussion in pt. 4). Kanauri c'ad Sl (with suffixed -d) has been brought into comparison via SiS(ms), equated with Sl under cross-cousin marriage. Kachin ta'a MB,MBS(ws) can be explained only on the basis of a reciprocal development from SiS(ms). Mikir o-se SiS(ms),Sl shows an ideal agreement on the semantic side, but the comparison is phonetically dubious. The root *ts'a appears to be lacking in other groups.

SA
●601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 The roots *su and *tu have distributions which are almost, if not quite, mutually exclusive. *Su gCh appears in Kachin, Bodo, Mikir, and Meithei, while *tu appears in Nung (N), Burmish-Loloish (xN), and Kukish (FSiCh,SiCh,ms,gCh). Anu, a Southern Kuki language, has su xC,ySi(ws),SiCh(ws),gCh, and a-su-lai SiCh(ms), covering much the same ground as Kukish *tu. The roots *su and *tu must be regarded as distinct on general phonetic grounds, and this view is strengthened by the evidence from Meithei, which has i-su gCh as well as (ma-)tu W (cf. the Kuki use of *tu in the meaning "Sl", through cross-cousin marriage). The root *su is perhaps also represented in the Naga languages, in much the same setting as Anu su, viz. Angami cu ~ tsu FSiS,ySiS(ms),gS, Nzong Rengma a-cu-gü, Ntenyi Rengma a-zu-wa, Anyo Rengma a-zü FSiCh,SiCh(ms),gCh, but our knowledge of Naga phonology is not sufficiently advanced to establish this comparison.

A fourth root of the same general type is *ma-li, which is found in Nung (gCh), Burmish-Loloish (gCh), Pyu (gCh), Chang (xN), Garo (SiS,ms), Mikir (xN, probably BCh,ws), and has an additional cognate in Kachin (ma-li "young man"). This root is in general lacking in Kukish, but may be represented by Taungtha lwi Ne,Ni and Yindu (ka-)li BD(ws). It cannot be traced in Tibetan or any of the northern languages.

The affinal root corresponding to *mak Sl is perhaps *nam Dl, but the evidence for the latter root is not altogether satisfactory. Lepcha has nyom < *snam Dl paralleling myok < *smak Sl, and s- prefixed forms are also represented by

SA Kanauri stem < *snem (probably for snăm) Dl, and Barish
●601 *snam Dl (based on Dimasa ba-ham, Garo nam). Cf. also
193 Gyarung snom < *snam Si, Burmese hnam < *snam ySi(ms)
197 (inferred from mong-hnam "H and W", where mong means "yB,wB"),
ST Lashi tu-nam Dl, nam-mo ySi(ms), Nyi nă-mo < *nam-mo ySi(ms),
601 and Lushei hnăm < *snăm "clan". The unprefixed form appears
193 in Syangsi nam-sia Dl, Kachin nam Dl,ySil, and Nung nam Sb,
197 while Lepcha has both nyom < *snam Dl and nom < *nam oSi.
Magari ar-năm "girl" also belongs in this series.

Of more restricted distribution are the roots *mou Dl, represented by Kukish mou (Lushei mo), Meithei i-mau, and perhaps Tibetan mo "woman", and *k'rwi Sl, represented by Kachin k'ri Sl,SiCh(ms), Burmese k'rwe^{3}-ma^{1} < *k'rwi^{3}-ma^{1}, Lisu c'i-ma Dl (with feminine suffix -ma), and perhaps Lepcha tă-gri "male". The original meanings of these roots may have been simply "female" and "male", respectively.

There remain for consideration a few poorly represented roots connected primarily with the PSb nomenclature. Nung a-tsim MSi is comparable with Tsangla a-tim, id., and Nung a-wang FB with Garo a-wang FyB, also Lashi vang-mo HF,FoSiH, Maru vung ~ vun HF,FSiH (but the Lashi and Maru terms suggest a meaning "MB" rather than "FB"). The *wang series is perhaps connected with Tibetan 'a-bang FSiH,MSiH (literary), Limbu (am-)pang-a "uncle", Vayu pong-pong < *pang-pang FB.

Tibetan sru MSi has been compared with Kanauri and Chamba Lahuli ru Fl, Pyu sru "relatives", and the reconstructed

SA Lolo root *ru MB. If these terms actually constitute a true
601 series, we must reconstruct a root *sru ~ *ru "mother's
193 relatives" (neuter), whence Kanauri ru Fl < MB through cross-
197 cousin marriage, paralleling Kanauri c'ad Sl < SlS(ms). The
ST presence of this root in Pyu, at approximately the year
601 A.D. 1000, lends some weight to this view.
193 The fourth Tibetan PSb term, viz. ʾa-ˇzang MB, is found
197 in this form in Thebor and Lepcha, where it must be regarded as a loan-word, but not elsewhere. This form can be derived from an original *zrang and thus compared with Mru ta-rang FSiH,HF, Kukish ta-rang ~ ma-rang, id., and probably Lhota o-nra, Changki (Ao) (kŭ-)hram Bl(ws). Burmese a-hrang < *srang (archaic spelling is a-hsyang) "lord, master" also perhaps belongs here rather than with sring-mo Si (supra). The writer has long suspected that Tibetan initial ˇz- and ˇs- have in many instances been derived from zr- and sr-, respectively, partly because of the general instability of these clusters in Tibetan (cf. srab-srib ~ hrab-hrib ~ [illegible]rib "dim, obscure"), and partly on the basis of comparative material, viz. Tib. ˇsig "louse", Bunan ˇsrig, Lushei hrik < *srik; Tib. ˇzag "day (24 hours)", Burmese rak, id.; Tib. ˇsags "joke, jest" (in sense of "ridicule"), Bunan ˇsrag "shame", Burmese hrak < *srak "to be ashamed". The root *-rang (prefixed) must have had a generalized honorific force (still retained in Burmese), and thus was admirably suited as a periphrastic term either for MB or for FSiH,HF (= MB under cross-cousin marriage).

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

Having completed our review of Tibeto-Burman kinship roots, we are now faced with the problem of fixing the basic pattern of nomenclature for this linguistic family. The terms designating relatives in the central line of descent naturally form the most stable segment of the nomenclature, while the collateral terms show an intermediate, and the affinal terms a maximum, amount of variation.

Within this stable core of nomenclature we are able to distinguish two primary gP terms (gM and gF), two primary P terms (M and F), a neuter ySb term, and a neuter Ch term. The two neuter terms are often employed in a masculine sense (yB and S), with sex affixes used in forming the corresponding feminine terms (ySi and D), e.g. Tibetan bu S, bu-mo D, Burmese sa^3 S, $sa\text{-}mi^3$ D. No neuter P terms have been uncovered, but Chang has a neuter gP term (a-pi < *p'i gM) used only in address, and a neuter gP term is also found in Sema (a-pu-za), and in the Southern Kuki languages Sho (a-pǒ) and Ayaing Khami (a-um-si). Three Southern Kuki languages (Chinbok, Yindu, Anu) make a distinction between FM and MM, but have a single term for gP (Anu FM < M, MM < gM). Four gP terms appear only in rare instances, and are never all primary. Both Tibetan and Kanauri show traces of three or four gP terms, but Kanauri has probably borrowed one or more of its gP terms from Tibetan, and the Tibetan material itself can be interpreted in more than one way. Kachin seems to employ four gP terms, perhaps because of Shan influence, but has only two primary terms (ji gF and woi gM). Garo distinguishes

SA between "gP" (= FF) and "gM" (= FM), and "my gF" (= MF) and
601 "my gM" (= MM), if we can trust our sources for this language.
193 In view of the fact that the Garo are a matrilineal group,
197 this point is of some interest. Chang, which uses the neuter
ST term a-pi gP in address, employs four terms in reference, the
601 FF and FM terms being formed through affixed sex elements,
193 and the MF and MM terms through analysis. Finally, Laiyo,
197 which has an almost exclusively analytical nomenclature, employs four analytical gP terms.

A number of different arrangements of Sb terms have been encountered. Age distinctions appear everywhere and are, in general, more prominent than sex distinctions. Despite this, however, it would appear that the basic pattern has two primary terms for oB and oSi, contrasting with the single neuter ySb term (*nau). As has been shown above, the widespread tendency to equate oB and oSi with terms for relatives of ascending generations has obscured the general picture here and has made analysis almost impossible. The simplest possible arrangement (oSb and ySb) has been found only in Khami (Ayaing and Awa) and Anyo Rengma. A single primary term for oSb appears also in Kuki proper (u) and in Burmese (ate-), but Burmish-Loloish in general has two primary oSb terms. Nzong Rengma shows a complete reversal of the ordinary pattern, with terms for oSb, yB, and ySi. Tibetan, Lepcha, Dafla, Kachin, Aka, Lisu, Chang, Chinbon, Ao and probably other less accurately recorded languages have what appears to be the basic arrangement, viz. oB, oSi, and ySb (three primary

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

terms). The Barish languages in general employ the root *nau ySb in the meaning "ySi" and have developed a new term for yB (perhaps connected with the Kachin term for B,ws), while Meithei reverses this process in employing *nau for "yB" and the Kukish root *dzar·Si(ms) for ySi. Simple terms for either B or Si are almost entirely lacking in Tibeto-Burman. Abor-Miri has terms for B and Si based on a root *buir (cf. a-buir "friend"), while in Dafla the cognate form *bör is used as the root for ySb, but note that Abor-Miri also possesses especial terms for oSb and ySb. Mikir hor Sb, like Abor-Miri buir, also has the more general meaning "friend".

Though the principle of age distinctions can be established as a basic feature of Tibeto-Burman kinship terminology, the status of sex-of-speaker distinctions is not so readily settled. We are handicapped here by the fact that most of our sources can not be depended upon in showing non-European distinctions of this type, and that negative evidence is therefore of little value. Distinct terms for Si(ms) and B(ws) are found in Tibetan, Kachin, Lushei and Lakher (and probably other Kuki languages), and Angami. Lushei and Lakher also have a distinct term (of periphrastic origin) for Si(ws). In Burmese and Nyi the distinction is applied only to ySb, viz. Burmese yB(ms), yB(ws), ySi(ws), ySi(ms), Nyi ySb(ms), yB(ws), ySi(ms), and Maru, in the same linguistic group, has a distinct term for yB(ws). Mikir distinguishes between oSi(ms) and oSi(ws), and has a distinct term for B(ws). Chinbok and Yindu, in the Southern

SA Bahi group have a full set of eight 1b terms, showing complete
●601 distinctions both for age and for sex-of-speaker. The Chinbok
193 system can be reduced to five primary terms, viz. pai cBi(ms),
197 pwo cB(ms), nau yBb(ms), bo Bi(ms), and baug B(ws), i.e. the
ST Tibetan-Kachin arrangement. Sex of speaker appears not to be
601 distinguished in Kanauri, Abor-Miri, Dafla, Barish, Meithei,
193 and some other languages, but our sources, as mentioned above,
197 are not of the most dependable sort. In view of the weight of evidence above, from such key languages as Tibetan, Kachin, Burmese, Mikir, and Lushei, the writer is inclined to regard the sex-of-speaker distinction as an archaic Tibeto-Burman feature.

Despite the fact that no single gCh root can with certainty be reconstructed for Tibeto-Burman, one can surely regard the presence of a primary gCh term as a basic feature for this linguistic family. Aside from the tendency to equate gCh with N or C (vide infra), it can be stated that most Tibeto-Burman languages have a distinct, usually primary, term for gCh, e.g. Kachin ʌ̀nu, Burmese nʌ̀, Byangsi k'we, Kanauri c'ay, Lepcha a-ceu, Chang ʌ̀ni, Garo and Mikir su, Meithei i-nu. If a single gCh root must be predicated, TB *nu must be regarded as the most likely selection. Equations of gCh other than with N are exceptional, but note Sema a-nu gCh= Ch(< TB *nau yBb).

The above discussion is resumed in the following diagram:

SA
●601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

Tibeto-Burman Basic Pattern

gM (*p'i) gF (*p'u)

M (*ma) F (*p'a)

oSi(ws) oB(ms)

Si(ms) yZb (*nau) B(ws)

Ch (*za)

gCh

It would be a rather hazardous undertaking to attempt any general explanation of the pattern outlined above in terms of sociological factors. A broad theory of this type must be based on a comprehensive comparative survey of Tibeto-Burman with a number of other groups, and as such lies outside the scope of the present study. Many of the variations from this pattern are undoubtedly significant, but they involve those elusive culturo-linguistic intangibles which do not lend themselves to arm-chair analysis. It is only in the collateral and affinal nomenclatures that obvious cultural correlations are available, and it is these that the writer proposes to consider in some detail.

The distinction between cross (FSi and MB) and parallel (FB and MSi) FSb terms is almost universal in Tibeto-Burman. No instances of an equation of FB with MB have been encountered, but FSi and MBi are equated in Bahing, Lepcha, and Chinbon, if we can trust our sources. Note that Lepcha also equates xC with pC, and that cross-cousin marriage is forbidden in this tribe.

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

The parallel FB and MSi terms are usually either equated with the F and M terms (as in Chang, Lushei, Angami, Sema) or are based on these terms, with the addition of elements meaning "big" and "little" or the like. In other words, age distinctions are made in the parallel FSb terms precisely as in the Sb terms, though with categorical rather than primary elements. By way of contrast, the cross FSb terms seldom show these age distinctions, but note Burmese u^3-ri^3 HoB (cf. a-ri^3 FSi), u^3-$mang^3$ HyB, Chinbok pu-$\overset{\vee}{s}r\breve{o}$ HoB (= gF), pu-ko HyB (these distinctions are typical of Southern Kuki in general). Some of the more characteristic examples of age distinctions in FB terms are listed below:

Language	FoB	FyB
Balti	a-ta ts'ar-ma	a-ta tsum-tso
Lepcha	a-bo-tim	a-bo-cum
Kachin	wa-di	wa-doi
Burmese	p'$\breve{a}$-kri^3	p'$\breve{a}$-t'we^3
Nyi	a-ba-gia	a-ba-[illegible]
Haka	pa-u	pa-mun
Siyin	pa-lien	pa-nc
Chinbon	pa k-dŏm	pa k-oui
Tangkhul	a-va k'$\breve{a}$-r$\breve{a}$r	a-va ka-tui
Lhota	o-po-ra-mo	o-po-ro

One occasionally encounters what seem to be primary terms for FB or MSi, but most of these can be explained on the basis of ellipsis, e.g. Maru t'ong HySi but nye-t'ong HySi,

SA p'a-t'ang FyB in the closely related Lashi language; Bodo
601 a-yong FoB and a-doi FyB, but ma-gyung MoSi and ma-doi MySi;
193 Nsong Rengma a-nyo FyB (nyo Ch), and perhaps Changki (Ao)
197 a-za FyB < *za Ch. Kanauri has a curious diminutive formation, viz. a-mats MSi < a-ma, and a-pats FB < a-pa. Tibetan
ST and Rung, however, appear to have four true PSb terms. The
601 Rung terms a-tsim MSi and a-wang FB have been compared with
193 Tsangla a-zim MSi and Garo a-wang FyB, respectively. The
197 Tibetan term sru MSi seems to have been derived from a root with the generalized meaning "mother's relatives", or "member of mother's clan, first ascending generation". Tibetan k'u FB, it can now be stated, has been developed from the TB root *k'u MB, and the Himalayish and Lepcha employment of this term in its Tibetan setting must be credited to Tibetan influence, which is conspicuous in both of these areas. Tibetan skud < *k'u Fl,Sl is to be explained in terms of xC marriage and the equation of MB with MF, as elsewhere in Tibeto-Burman. Tibetan 'a-ne FSi,MBF further fits into this picture. In Himalayish, Kanauri ru Fl < *sru MSb, and o'ad Sl < *ts'a SiS(ms) suggest a like reconstruction. We have some material on xC marriage in the Tibetan area, but the term skud itself is, for the writer, the most significant single piece of evidence. Those who minimize the value of linguistic "fossils" in general might well take note of this term.

The semantic shift FB < MB in the Tibetan term k'u still requires explanation. Elsewhere in Tibeto-Burman the term has

SA
●601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

been demoted to affinal rank or dropped altogether, but nowhere else has it been applied to FB. Now there is but one marital feature in which the Tibetan area (including the Kanauri group of Himalayish) significantly differs from the remaining Tibeto-Burman area, viz. polyandry. Fraternal polyandry of Tibetan type is practised by the Kanauri, almost certainly through Tibetan influence, since this custom is explicitly stated to be absent among the Almora peoples (Byangsi, Chaudangsi, Johar). Among the Lepcha polyandry is an abnormal trait and can unhesitatingly be assigned a Tibetan origin. Among other Tibeto-Burman group for which we have any record, polyandry either is said to be lacking or is simply not mentioned. Since Tibetan polyandry is of fraternal type, the importance of FB can readily be understood. It would seem that the MB term, which is unstable in most TB groups, was first replaced by the honorific term ʾa-žang and later applied to FB. The collective term skud-po Fl,Bl, having already been semantically specialized in an affinal sense, was naturally retained.

Primary cross PSb terms are basic TB features, and are represented by the roots *ni FSi and *k'u MB. The first of these two terms, however, is much more stable than the second, and significantly so (if statistically treated). Thus, Tibetan has transferred the MB term to FB and used an honorific for MB; Burmish-Loloish has retained the MB term only as an honorific applied to oB (in Burmese) or as an affinal term

SA (Ahi, Moso) and has developed new terms for MB (Burmese n^3,
601 Lolo *ru); the Kuki languages proper have dropped the MB term
193 altogether and equated MB with gF; in the Naga group the MB
197 term has been preserved in its original setting only in Ao,
ST while in Rengma and Sema it has been retained only in the
601 affinal nomenclature. All of these groups, however, have the
193 root *ni FSi in its original setting. Burmese (but not
197 Burmish-Loloish) has replaced both the FSi and MB terms and dropped the former altogether, while Kachin has retained both terms only in its affinal nomenclature. The relatively greater stability of the FSi term is also evident in the borrowings made by various TB groups (infra).

This "differential variability" in the FSi and MB terms must be viewed in connection with the affinal application of these terms and the whole problem of cross-cousin marriage. Under bilateral xC marriage MB becomes Fl, and FSi becomes Ml, and it is not unlikely that honorific terms should become associated with these socially "pivotal" relationships. The fact that the MB=Fl term is more susceptible to this process than is the FSi=Ml term merely reflects the general patrilineal bias of Tibeto-Burman societies. The equation of MB with gP, which plays so prominent a role in Kukish, represents one aspect of this whole development, but teknonymy may also be a factor here ("Fl" designated as "gF of my son"). Teknonymy is hardly typical of Tibeto-Burman yet does occasionally occur. Lepcha, for example, employs a-bo F for Fl

SA
601 where the couple are childless, but t'i-kung gF after the
193 birth of a child, and the descriptive term a-fyut Fl has been
197 derived from an original *aput, which in turn represents a
ST morphological development from the TB root *p'u gF. Vayu
601 sa-k'i Fl appears to be a combination of sa < *sa Ch and
193 ki-ki gF. Lahu, in the Southern Lolo group, has a-p'u gF= Fl,
197 a-p'i gM=Ml, and Ahi, in the Northern Lolo group, has
su-p'o WF, also "paternal ancestor". The Chang Sbl terms are of teknonymous origin, e.g. hau-ko Bl(ms)="his MB", but the Chang Pl terms are simply Fl=MB and Ml= FSi. Chinbon equates WF with gF, and WM with gM (rather than with MB and MBW, as in most Kuki languages), but retains the Kuki pattern in the HM and HF terms (HF= FSi, and especial term for HF), i.e. the teknonymous (or honorific) terms are employed only by the husband. The Mirish languages (Abor, Miri, Dafla) afford the best illustration of teknonymy. In Miri the terms a-bu and a-nā are used for F and M, respectively, but in the closely related Abor language these terms are applied to gF and gM, though ta-ta (Miri ta-to gF) is retained as the vocative term for gF. In this instance the child has taken over his parents' terms ("reverse teknonymy") rather than the parent his childrens' terms. Abor also uses the vocative gF term (ta-ta) for Fl, while Miri equates Fl either with gF or with MB, and Ml either with gM or with FSi (the equations with MB and FSi are probably only descriptive, though this is not stated in our sources). Dafla equates Ml with gM, probably also Fl with gF.

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

Under a system of bilateral xC marriage we should expect to find both WF and HF equated with MB, and both WM and HM equated with FSi. This condition is fulfilled in Byangsi and Abor-Miri, where this type of marriage is in vogue. The terminological equation also appears, however, in Nung, Chang, Sema, Nzong Rengma, and Lhota, for all of which preferential MBD marriage is indicated, and in Tangkhul and Angami, for which xC marriage cannot be established.

A system of unilateral xC marriage with MBD should lead to the equation of WF with MB, HM with FSi, and separate terms for HF and WM, as well as distinctions between FSiH and MB, MBW and FSi. Kachin fulfills all these conditions admirably, with unilateral xC marriage coupled with the terminological equations indicated above. The same can be said for the Kuki pattern, as illustrated in Lakher, Thado, Chawte, Tarau, as well as in Mru and Khami, viz. WF=MB, WM=MBW, HM=FSi, HF=FSiH. Unilateral MBD marriage is found among the Thado, Chiru, Anal, Aimol, Purum, and probably the Anal, Sho, and Khami. In Thado this nomenclature is employed only where MBD marriage has actually occurred, P terms being employed under other conditions.

Ntenyi and Anyo Rengma have an intermediate type, with M1=FSi but WF=MB and a distinct term for HF, but in both languages the MB term is sometimes applied to HF as well as to WF. The closely related Nzong Rengma has a single term for F1 (WF,HF=MB), but retains a distinct term for FSiH. Sema has the same scheme as Nzong Rengma. The Sema term for FSiH,

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

furthermore, is cognate with the Ntenyi and Anyo Rengma term for HF, and in Ao the same term appears in its original setting (MB). This Naga material thus shows various stages of the transformation of the affinal terminology through the development of unilateral xC marriage. The discrepancies found in Nung, Chang, and Lhota are perhaps more apparent than real, and in the case of Nung and Lhota, at any rate, our sources may be faulty. Even in these affinal features, however, we must expect to find a certain amount of dissociation, for we must allow for linguistic "lag", i.e. the simple scheme of equating Fl with MB and Ml with FSi tends to be perpetuated even where the development of a unilateral "skew" has rendered it theoretically illogical. This general point has been raised many times before, but will bear repetition in view of the fact that a number of modern theoreticians seem to object to this sort of reasoning.

It is fairly evident that the abandonment of xC marriage as an institutionalized norm has in several different groups resulted in the disappearance of categorical equations. In Tibetan and Kanauri we have only the "fossilized" terms skud-po and ru, respectively, which require comparative studies for a full appraisal of their significance. In Lahul, however, where we have a hint of xC marriage, the equations Fl=MB and Ml=FSi are in evidence. In Burmese itself categorical equations are lacking, and here also we have no evidence of xC marriage, but the situation is reversed in Arakanese (Chaungtha).

SA
●601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

Maru and Lashi, which are of Burmese stock, equate Ml with FSi, WF with MB, and have a distinct term for FSiH, HF (as in Nsong and Anyo Rengma). Kachin influence perhaps plays a role here, yet the Kachin distinguish between WM and HM, as is consistent with their unilateral xC marriage practice. Nyi, in the Northern Lolo group, has derived its terms for WF and WM from the terms for MB and FSi, respectively, plus the element mo "old", acting here as an honorific, while the Burmish-Loloish affinal root *yok is employed in the terms for HM and HF. Ahi seems to reverse this scheme, to judge from our faulty data on this language. For Lisu we have only what appear to be the vocative terms for Fl and Ml (ma-ma < a-ma M, ba-ba < a-ba F), and hence are not in a position to interpret this Lolo material. The use of respectful designations may be a complicating factor here; cf. Lushei pu-zon WF, pi-zon WM, conforming to the Kuki pattern (from pu MB and pi MBW plus an added element -zon), but pa HF (= F) and nu HM (= M), i.e. a woman equates her husband's relatives with her own blood kin.

Categorical equations in the Fl terms are present elsewhere, but our sources are often incomplete. Garo equates Ml with FSi, MBW, but has a distinct term for Fl (a-bu-di, perhaps "little gF"). Mikir equates WF with MB, WM with FSi (with or without the addition of an honorific suffix), and has a distinct term for HF. If we assume that HM (not given in our sources) is also equated with FSi, this system can be compared with that found in Rengma and Maru. Both Garo and Mikir have

SA preferential MBD marriage. Meithei equates Ml with FSi, and
601 has i-ku Fl < TB *k'u MB (the MB term is not known for sure,
193 but may be the Indic loan-word māmā); the Meithei are not
197 known to practice xC marriage.

ST The rest of the collateral terminology (C and N terms)
601 is even more poorly known than the FSb terminology, and
193 presents even more serious problems. In view of the presence
197 of basic TB roots for MB (*k'u) and FSi (*ni) one might expect to find one or more roots for xC, but such is hardly the case. The extension of Sb terms to include pC is practically universal and need not be examined in detail. The lack of especial xC terms is probably associated with the lack of xC marriage, but there are too many lacunae in our data to permit of any final judgment here. Tibetan apparently fails to distinguish between pC and xC, but Burmese perhaps has a distinct xC term (sa-mi^{3}-mrok-sa^{3}, lit. "D's spouse"!). By way of contrast, Chaungtha, one of the Arakanese dialects, has yauk-pa Bl,xC corresponding to Burmese yok-p'a^{3} Bl(ms), in conformity with its equation of Fl with MB and Ml with FSi, i.e. an affinal term has "invaded" the consanguineal nomenclature.

Terms for xCe and xCi in conjunction with xC marriage are found in Byangsi-Chaudangsi, Abor-Miri, Lisu, and Chang, while Dafla has this terminological pattern but without data on xC marriage. Chang appears to have preferential MBD marriage, but the bilateral type is found among the others.

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 Byangsi-Chaudangsi makes a sex-of-speaker distinction, viz. xCi(ms), xCe(ws), xC(ss), and Abor-Miri makes an age distinction. None of the terms involved is associated with a PSb term or a N term. The Abor-Miri terms show "invasion" from the affinal terminology, as in Chaungtha, e.g. mag-bo xCe(os) = oBl,Sl, from TB *mak Sl. Note that in Byangsi-Chaudangsi, Abor-Miri, and Chang this xC pattern is associated with the simple Pl = PSb categorical equations (for Lisu we lack full information on the Pl terms).

Cross-cousin terminologies of Omaha type are found in two primary foci, viz. Kachin and Kukish. The correlation between the Omaha nomenclature and patrilineal descent, one of the few widely accepted anthropological generalizations, obtains both among the Kachin and the various Kuki and Naga tribes. Of the Tibeto-Burman peoples only the Garo and Khasi, in the Barish group, are known to have matrilineal descent, and unfortunately we know nothing of the cousin terminology in use among these tribes. There is a hint of the Crow type of terminology in Bodo, also in the Barish group, but we cannot be sure that the Bodo reckon descent in the matrilineal line. Bodo (nang-)a-doi "(thy) oBCh", (a-)doi FyB show reciprocity, as has already been pointed out, but Bodo nam-ba-noi "(thy) SiS", (nang-)a-noi "(thy) SiD", and a-noi FSi cannot be explained on this basis and suggest rather the Crow pattern. It is greatly to be regretted that our Garo sources fail us at this critical point.

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

The Kachin system, which is quite distinct from that found in Kukish, merits especial examination. The key terms are as follows:

Kachin Omaha Pattern

(Consanguineal)

moi FSi
ning xCi(ws)
k'ri FSiD(ms),SiCh(ms)
rat MBD(oms)
nam MBD(yms),BCh(ws)
ts'a MB,MBS(ws)
k'au xCe(ms)

(Affinal)

ni WM,MBW,WBW
moi HM
ning HSi,BW(ws)
nam Dl,WySi,yBW(ms),WBCh
ku HF,FSiH,HoB,oSiH(ws)
ts'a WF,BWB(ws)
k'au WB,SiH(ms)
k'ri Sl,HSiCh,FSiHSi
rat WoSi,ySiH(ws),oBW(ms),HyB

The main features of this system have already been discussed in pt. 7. It will be observed that the lineal equations characteristic of the Omaha pattern appear only in the terms for non-marriageable cross-cousins under the Kachin unilateral xC marriage arrangement, i.e. a man equates his (non-marriageable) FSiD with his SiCh, while a woman equates her (non-marriageable) MBS with her MB. The terms applied by a woman to her (marriageable) FSiS are not known, but a man equates his (marriageable) MBD with his WSi. Distinct terms are used by speakers of each sex for xC(ss).

SA
●601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

On the basis of comparative material, the terms nan and k'ri must be regarded as originally affinal (D1 and S1, respectively). Both terms have "invaded" the consanguineal nomenclature via the categorical equations D1=BD(ws) and S1=SiS(ms), as are consistent with the practice of MBD marriage. Note that both terms have become neuter in the course of this transformation. We must next enquire of the fate of the original xN terms thus displaced. The terms moi FSi and ts'a MB can be called upon at this point. We lack comparative material on moi, but Tibetan has ts'a SiS(ms) corresponding to the Kachin term, and we can therefore interpret Kachin ts'a MB as a product of reciprocal usage. We have conclusive support for this view in the term k'ri HSiCh,FSiHSi, which at first puzzled the writer. Under the Kachin tripartite organization, as described by Gilhodes, FSiHSi becomes MBW, and MBW ~ HSiCh are reciprocal terms. Since moi FSi closely parallels ts'a MB, we are justified in interpreting this term analogically as a reciprocal development from BD(ws).

To continue our analysis, moi and ts'a have displaced the original cross PSb terms ni and ku, which are retained in the affinal nomenclature. An original system of bilateral xC marriage must be postulated to account for ni WZ,MBW < FSi, and ku HF,FSiH < MB. The categorical equations shown by ning xCi(ws)=Sil(ws) and k'au xCe(ms)=Bl(ms) also call for this type of marriage.

To complete our reconstruction, the terms ning, k'au, and rat must be regarded as originally consanguineal rather

SA than affinal. We have comparative material only for ning,
601 which is represented by Chang (Konyak) nyŭng < *ning xC,
193 Nikir neng < *ning BW(ws). We must further reconstruct rat
197 as the term for xC(ds), i.e. the marriageable xC under the
ST original bilateral xC marriage arrangement. This yields the
601 theoretical categorical equations xCi(ms)=Sil(ms) and xCe(ws)=
193 Bl(ws). Under the conventional type of levirate, which is
197 found among the Kachin, a distinction must be made between the (marriageable) oBW and the (non-marriageable) yBW. In Kachin this distinction is made, in the case of a man, by equating yBW with Dl (nam) and in retaining the term rat for oBW, and, in the case of a woman, by equating HoB with HF (ku) and in retaining the term rat for HyB. Since a man marries his MBD, the distinction between rat MBD(oms) and nam MBD(yms) is the natural result of that described above. It is a fair inference that the missing terms for FSiS(ws) are ku FSiS(ows) and rat FSiS(yws). Note that the equation of MBD(yms) with BCh(ws) is a by-product, so to speak, and is not to be taken as a 'Crow' feature.

We are now in a position to evaluate the Omaha features of the Kachin system. It has been demonstrated that the Kachin have developed a unilateral xC marriage system from an original bilateral arrangement, and that this shift has produced a profound transformation in the kinship terminology. The equating of MBS(ws) with MB, and of FSiD(ms) with SiCh(ms) serves to distinguish the non-marriageable from the marriageable

SA cross-cousins. These equations closely parallel those already
● 601 noted in the Sbl terminology, and appear to form part of the
193 same pattern. If this inference be correct, we must regard
197 the institution of the levirate as a contributing factor here.
ST The Kachin terminology under the original bilateral xC
601 marriage system can be reconstructed as follows:
193
197

Reconstructed Kachin System

(Consanguineal)

ni FSi	ku MB
ning xCi(ws)	k'au xCe(ms)
rut xC(ds)	
moi SD(ws)	ts'a SiS(ms)

(Affinal)

ni MBW,Ml	ku FSiH,Fl
ning Sil(ss)	k'au Sl(ss)
rut Sbl(ds)	
nam Dl	k'ri Sl

Maru and Lashi, which are of Burmese stock, show Omaha features of Kachin type, e.g. Lashi so-ok FSiD(ms),SiCh(ms) and zo-auk Sl (a variant of so-ok), directly comparable with the Kachin term k'ri. Our material here is too uncertain to justify any further investigation of this point, and we have no data on the Maru and Lashi marriage practices. Both tribes are closely identified with the Kachin, and have even incorporated Kachin loan-words into their kinship nomenclatures, so that direct Kachin influence must be reckoned with in this

SA matter. To judge from what little we know of the collateral
601 terms of other Burmish-Loloish languages, Omaha features are
193 not present. There is some evidence suggesting that the root
197 *tu is applied both to N and C in Lisu and in Ulu (Northern
ST Lolo), but the Lisu material is inconsistent and the Ulu
601 material is not precise
193
197 The Omaha nomenclatures found among the Kukish tribes are quite distinct in type from the Kachin nomenclature. The Kuki tribes proper, including Southern Kuki and Tangkhul, employ the following basic scheme (in many varieties):

Kuki Omaha Pattern

(Consanguineal)

pi gM,MBD pu gF,MB,FBS

ni FSi

tu FSiCh,SiCh(ms),gCh

(Affinal)

pi MBW,WF,WSi pu WF,WB

ni HM -rang FSiH,HF

mou DI,BW(ws) mak SI,SiH(ws)

Lushei has an especial term for BCh(ws), viz. va' (apparently connected with the root *wa H), and Yindu has an especial term for BD(ws), viz. (ka-)li, which has been compared with the root *ma-li gCh (Burmese, Nung), xM (Jingpho). In Siyin and Chavte, however, BCh(ws) is equated with Ch. The analyzing development in Laiyo has entirely obliterated all traces of the Omaha system, yet the term tu FSiCh is

SA retained. Haka has both (k-)tu FSiCh and the analytical term
601 (k-)ni fa as an alternative. Lakher applies Sb terms (in
193 address) to FSiCh and occasionally to MSCh, and both Thado
197 and Aimol sometimes apply the oSb term to FSiCh(os). Chinbok
ST employs an analytical term for MBS, but equates MBD with MySi.
601 Thado resembles Chinbok in equating MBD with MSi, but elsewhere
193 the regular equation is with MBW = gM. Chinbok is further
197 aberrant in equating FSiS with SiS(ms) but having a distinct
term for gS. Yindu equates DS with SiS, FSiS, but employs an
analytical term for SS. Yindu has distinct terms for MSCh,
and Kyaw has distinct terms both for MSCh and FSiCh(i.e.
Omaha features are lacking). Aimol, if we can trust our
sources, has reversed the Kuki pattern, with (ka-)pu FSiS
and (ka-)tu-pa MBS. Chinbon has MoBS = MyB, MyBS = WB, reflecting the stress placed on age distinctions in Southern Kuki.
Our Chawte material, which is not reliable, indicates a
distinction between FSiS(ws) and FSiD(ms), and the equation
of SiCh(mws) with gCh. The affinal term mak Sl is commonly
replaced by the consanguineal term tu SiS(ms), as in Haka,
Chawte, and Sho, and the reverse process whereby an affinal
term "invades" the consanguineal nomenclature (as in Kachin)
is illustrated by Kyaw sa-mak SiCh(ms) = Sl, and Ayaing Khasi
mok-sa FSiCh, SiCh(ms) = Sl, both from the root *mak Sl. The
latter language has retained the root *tu, however, in the
term (ka-)tu FSiCh(ws), gS.

It is evident from the above citations that this Omaha
pattern is extremely susceptible to variation at all points.

SA Nothing approaching the specific Kachin variety has been
●601 encountered, however, and the two systems seem to have little
193 in common. In the Kuki system the equations FSiCh=SiCh(ms)
197 and MBS=MB obtain regardless of the sex or speaker, there are
ST additional equations of MB with gF and SiCh(ms) with gCh,
601 and ni FSi is retained as a consanguineal term. In addition,
193 distinct terms for xC(ss) and Sbl are lacking. The historical
197 developments of the two systems have been quite different, if
we are permitted to draw inferences from comparative data.
The terms pi and pu are the original gP terms (TB *p'i gM,
*p'u gF), and the term -rang (prefixed) can be regarded as the
original term for MB, cognate with Tibetan ?a-žang < *zrang MB
(cf. Kachin ku HF,FSiH=MB). The term tu occasions some
difficulty, since we have only the Burmish-Loloish root *tu
and the Nung term pa-du, both applied to M (xM in Burmese)
for comparison. In view of the parallelism in the equations
MB=gF and xM=gCh, however, we must fix the original meaning
of tu as "gCh" rather than "xM". The clue to these equations
seems to be teknonymy in conjunction with xC marriage, i.e.
we must suppose that a man applied the teknonymous terms pu
gF and pi gM to his wife's parents, whereas a woman applied
the consanguineal terms ni FSi and -rang MB. With the develop-
ment of unilateral marriage with MBD, a feature found in the
Kuki area as well as in Kachin, the two sets of Pl terms were
fully differentiated in function, and the term pu Pl=gF
replaced the consanguineal term -rang MB, with pi coming into

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

use for MBW. The equation of SiCh(ms) with gCh was the natural result of the above development. Since the term ni FSi was retained in its original setting, no comparable term was developed for the reciprocal relationship BCh(ws). The evidence for the use of teknonymous terms in Tibeto-Burman in general has been resumed above and need not be discussed at this point. Within the Kuki group, note Chinbon (ka-)mo-pauk WH=gF and (ka-)mu-bok MoB (probably a variant of the foregoing), (ka-)mo WM= gM and (ka-)mok MoBW (probably a variant of the foregoing), but (ka-)se HF (analysis uncertain), (ka-)zi HM=FSi. Chinbon thus makes use of teknonymous terms precisely as suggested above for the Kuki group in general.

We are still faced with the problem of explaining the equations MBS= MB, MBD= MBW (or MSi), and FSiCh=SiCh(ms). Here again we must take into account the affinal setting of these terms under a system of unilateral xC marriage with MBD. The fundamental equation seems to have been that between WF and WB (pu) rather than between MB and MBS, i.e. these kin were identified because of the similarity of their roles as wife's father and brother rather than as mother's brother and mother's brother's son. In other terms, the especial position of MB and MBS among the Kuki groups seems in large measure to have arisen through xC marriage. The equation of FSiCh with SiCh(ms) reflects the equation of MBS with MB, just as the equation of SiCh(ms) with gCh reflects the equation of MB with gF.

It is possible to conceive of the Kuki development without recourse to teknonymy simply by assuming that pu gF was

SA applied to MB and MBS in an honorific sense, with tu gCh
●601 SiCh(ms)=FSiCh as a complementary equation. In any event,
193 the equation in the MB line must be regarded as the primary
197 one, and the equation in the FSi line as complementary. The
ST same situation was found to obtain among the Kachin (supra).
601
193 The Naga languages, which make up the northern division
197 of the Kukish group, also reveal Omaha features, which are of Kuki rather than Kachin type. MBD is equated with MSi or MySi rather than with gM=MBW. In Ao (all three dialects) the terms for gF (o-pu) and gCh (sam-cir) are distinct, i.e. there is no teknonymy, the TB root *k'u is retained in the consanguineal nomenclature (o-k'u MB,MBS) while MBD is equated with MySi, and the affinal terms for Sl (a-nok) and Dl (a-mu) are applied to FSiS,SiS(ms) and FSiD,SiD(ms), respectively, precisely as in Ayaing Khami. Sema has a distinct term for gF (neuter) and equates gCh with Ch, but has developed a new root for MB,MBS (a-ngu) and has retained the root *k'u only in the affinal meaning "FSiH" (a-ci). Thus both Ao and Sema show full Omaha features without distinction of sex of speaker (as in Kuki) but also without teknonymy (as in Kachin). The Angami, Rengma, and Lhota systems, however, all show teknonymous features. Rengma (all three dialects) equates MB,MBS(os) with gF (ggF in Nzong), and FSiCh,SiCh(ms) with gCh. Lhota shows a partial equation of MB,MBS with gF (o-mo and o-mo-tsü) and at least similar terms for FSiS,SiS(ms) and gS (o-hro and o-hre). Angami equates FSiS,ySiS(ms) with gS, but distinguishes between

SA gF and MB, yet the term for the latter (mi) is connected with
●601 the Rengma term for gF,MB (a-mi ~ a-mui) and the Lhota term
193 for MB (o-mo) and gF (o-mo-tsŭ). We can thus interpret Angami
197 mi MB as the original term for gF,MB and in this way explain
ST the lack of symmetry in the Angami nomenclature as it now
601 stands (a man calls his sister's child "gCh", but a child
193 calls his mother's brother "uncle"). Angami lacks the Omaha
197 traits on one side, since MBCh is addressed or described by name, or analytically if the need arises. The Rengma equations on the MB side appear only in the vocative nomenclature, and only when the cousin (MBS or MBD) addressed is older than speaker.

As noted in pt. 16, Majumder attempted to explain some of the features of the Sema nomenclature in terms of marriage with F's widow, after the fashion instituted by Rivers. Almost no instances of marriages of this type have been encountered in the Tibeto-Burman area, however, and the writer fails to see how Rivers' theories are of any relevancy in the present situation. The most curious form of marriage noted is the Lisu marriage with FSi cited by Fraser, and this is not reflected in the Lisu nomenclature. Omaha features among the Omaha and Miwok are perhaps based on MBD marriage, but for the American evidence there is no unanimity of opinion, and at least three recent writers on the subject (White, Gifford, Tax) have attacked this as a general explanation. Of this trio White alone suggests a general explanation, viz. that the Omaha type

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 is developed from the Dakota-Iroquois type (pC=Sb, xC distinct term) under the influence of a mature and vigorous patrilineal clan system. Gifford has successfully attacked this view on the basis of the American material, and the same general strictures are applicable in the Tibeto-Burman field, where no correlation can be established between strong patrilineal clans and the Omaha type of terminology.

The Kuki equation of xN with gCh is also encountered in Miri (ā < o-i "child below") and Tibetan (ts'a). Miri has retained the TB root *k'u MB (a-kū), but does apply teknonymous terms to Fl and Ml (= MB and FSi under the Miri bilateral xC marriage system). In Tibetan, however, teknonymy has been found only in the dialect of Bathang (eastern Tibet) as recorded by Desgodins, who cites rmo-rmo Ml=MM (hence a man's term for his WM). Abor shows reverse teknonymy in the shifts a-bu gF < F and a-nă gM < M, reflected in the equation o Ch= N=gCh (Abor, like Miri, applies teknonymous terms to Fl and Ml).

SA 601 ST 601 We are perhaps not justified in concluding that all equations of xN with gCh are based on teknonymy involving the affinal nomenclature (gF> Fl=MB), but no better general explanation can be suggested. The general thesis outlined above conforms to the basic Tibeto-Burman sociological pattern of cross-cousin marriage, and thus enjoys an initial advantage over any alternative theories of a more an hoc nature.

Reciprocal terminology has already been mentioned in connection with Kachin ts'a MB < SiCh(ms), k'ri HBiCh,FSiHSi,

SA 601 ST 601

and Bodo a-doi FyB, nang-a-doi oBCh. This phenomenon is not typical of Tibeto-Burman but can be traced in a few languages. Newari ni-ni FSi, i-ni Dl (< HD,ws) is comparable with Kachin ts'a. The following instances of grandparental reciprocity have been noted: Lepcha a-so ggF ∿ a-son gCh (with -n suffix); Bodo a-bau gF,gCh, Moran a-lu gF,gCh (as cited by Gurdon); Lisu a-lɛ̀ ggF, lɛ̀-pa gS (and perhaps a-za gM, za S), which are not strictly reciprocal. Note also Lushei t'la' "a descendant, posterity", t'la'-tu "an ancestor, progenitor" (apparently formed with the root *tu gCh), Siyin tu-k'an ta-k'an "descendant; ancestor", based on tu < *tu gCh and ta < *za Ch. Lisu also has the combined terms pa-la "F and Ch", ma-la "M and Ch", and pi-li "gF and gCh", all used in a collective sense. Kanauri spats gCh seems to have been derived from a-pa F, with the diminutive suffix -ts as in a-pats FB and the a- prefix as in Tib. p'a-spad "F and Ch" (collective).

To resume the foregoing discussion, we have reconstructed for the Tibeto-Burman peoples a sociological pattern of bilateral xC marriage and a corresponding linguistic pattern with primary terms for MB and FSi, for Sl, and perhaps for Dl, but with the affinal nomenclature in general based on categorical equations. In the Lowie system this pattern would be designated "bifurcate merging". The breakdown of the xC marriage pattern is shown to have directly influenced the affinal nomenclature but to have exerted little effect on the consanguineal nomenclature. The development of unilateral xC

SA
●601
ST
601

marriage with MBD in Kachin and the Kuki and Naga tribes is associated with the presence of two sets of Fl terms and of Omaha features in the collateral terminology. This association naturally has no statistical significance, yet fits very well into the general picture.

The practice of unilateral xC marriage with MBD is to be interpreted in terms of asymmetric reckoning of descent, as has been brilliantly pointed out by B. Z. Seligman with especial reference to River's Pentecost material. The Pentecost society has matri-moieties with three patri-sections in each, and the Pentecost terminology shows Crow features, viz. ratahina W,MSi,FSi,FSiD, and nituna WBCh,Ch. The Pentecost pattern is thus the reverse of the Kachin-Kuki-Naga.

The Tibeto-Burman evidence is surprising, perhaps, in failing to suggest a basic pattern of dual organization. Rivers regarded xC marriage as the result of dual organization, and Radcliffe-Brown has expressed the belief that the "Dravidian-Australian" kinship system (xC marriage) is in some way correlated with dual organization. The latter point of view is perhaps that shared by the majority of anthropologists. In the Tibeto-Burman area, however, dual organization has been recorded only for some of the Old Kuki groups and for Garo and Rabha, with additional evidence from the Naga group. Bose (1934) has collected much material bearing on this point, but largely from inadequate sources and in wholly uncritical fashion. In a later article (1937) the same writer places

SA 601 ST 601

emphasis rather on the tri-clan arrangement as found among at least some sections of the Garo, and suggests that an originally matrilineal people had been submerged in a wave of patrilineal peoples coming from the north, and that the restriction against a woman's marrying into her mother's clan is a reflection of this matrilineal substratum. Another Indian ethnologist, Das (1935), postulates a mixture of a patrilineal people with dual organization and a matrilineal people. The Khasi are typically matrilineal, and hence one can easily envisage an archaic Khasi-Mon matrilineal substratum in the Assam-Burma area. The Tibeto-Burman peoples, on the other hand, were and are patrilineal, though practising xC marriage. The Garo, Rabha, and probably other members of the Barish linguistic stock are matrilineal, however, apparently through direct Khasi influence. The theory of a miscegenation between patrilineal and matrilineal peoples, as advocated by Bose and Das, is therefore likely enough, and serves as well as any other as a partial explanation of the development of the asymmetric mode of reckoning descent. It does not explain, however, why the Kachin, living in the upper Irrawaddy valley, should have adopted this feature, nor, inversely, why the Miklr, in close contact with the Khasi, should not have adopted it.

In the present study no effort can be made to follow through the historical and other implications raised by the postulation of an early Tibeto-Burman-speaking population with patrilineal descent and xC marriage. It is difficult to see

SA 601 ST 601 any historical connection with the "Dravidian-Australian" system suggested by Radcliffe-Brown (see also the articles by Hodson and Rivers), inasmuch as an intervening population of matrilineal Mon-Khmer-speaking peoples must also be postulated. From another point of view, the writer is unable to suggest any striking correlation between xC marriage and other cultural traits. According to the view expressed by Kroeber in a recent article (1938), this form of marriage would form part of the "secondary pattern" and would be (ultimately) referable to factors of residence or other elements of the "basic pattern". The argument seems to be that one must live somewhere, but can live without exogamic groupings, totems, and the like - that one must have kin, but not clans. It is equally true, however, that one must marry someone, and that his choice must lie either within the kin group or without, just as residence must be either patrilocal, matrilocal, or neither, with various combinations possible. This point of view seems to be implied in Seligman's (1929) discussion of incest and descent factors.

It is perhaps of some interest to point out that pre-marital sexual promiscuity and the institution of a bachelor's house or its equivalent are characteristic Tibeto-Burman traits. The writer has not collected data on either of these specific points, yet has been impressed by the almost universal distribution of these features. It is primarily among assimilated groups such as the Tibetans or Burmese that these traits are in abeyance. Contrast, for example, the primitive Abors

SA 601 ST 601

group with xC marriage and a type of bachelor's house with their immediate neighbors, the Tibetans, who practise polyandry rather than xC marriage (traces of the latter persist) and have nothing suggesting a bachelor's house. The same type of contrast is presented by the primitive Arakanese with xC marriage and premarital sexual freedom (Hutchinson, p. 113) and the sophisticated Burmese, who lack xC marriage and whose courtship pattern had become highly formalized even in medieval times (vide the interesting account by Kin). It is not suggested that xC marriage and premarital sexual laxity are necessarily correlated in any way, but, in the area under consideration, both appear to belong to the same general cultural stratum.

****

SA [121] ST [121]

The present study is of limited scope and comparative material has therefore been eliminated. The parallelism between the Kuki Omaha pattern and that found among the BaThonga and Nama Hottentot of South Africa, however, is too attractive to be omitted. The Nama Hottentot (Schapera, pp. 230 and ff.) employ the terms //náob gF,MB; //náos gM,MBW (but MB is now called omeb < Dutch oom "uncle", and MBW is now called mugis < Dutch moekie "little mother"); //núrib xCe,SiS(ms),gS; //núris xCi,SiD(ms),gD. This system can be converted into the Kuki type by limiting //núrib and //núris to FSiCh and applying //náob and //náos to MBCh. Schapera describes xC marriage of bilateral type, but notes that among

SA 601 ST 601

some tribes of the Nama marriage with MBD "is said to have been far more common" (p. 244). For the replacement of the MB term by the Dutch loan-word (omeb < oom), cf. the widespread Tibeto-Burman borrowing of the Indic term māmā MB (infra).

The BaThonga evidence (Junod, pp. 216 and ff.) is complicated by the existence of dialectical differences. The regular MB term is malume (Zulu malume MB), applied also to MBS. The Northern BaThonga, however, have kokwana gF, MB, MBS, ntuknlu SiS(ms), gS. The BaRonga clans are in a neatly transitional stage, with alternative sets of terms. Radcliffe-Brown (1924) has made an illuminating analysis of the BaThonga material, in which the significance of the terms malume ("male mother") and rarana ("female father") is pointed out (cf. also Firth's discussion of the FBi as "male father" in Tikopia). The BaThonga do not practice xC marriage, according to Junod, and the parallelism with Kuki thus breaks down at this point. Since the application of kokwana gF to MB is apparently of late origin here, the teknonymy principle is of no avail in this instance, and we must accept Radcliffe-Brown's mode of reasoning. Note that neither the Nama nor the BaThonga system is of true Omaha type.

****

SA 197 601 ST 197 601

Loan-words appear in many of the Tibeto-Burman kinship terminologies, and include terms of Indic, Chinese, and Shan origin, as well as of Tibeto-Burman origin. Indic loan-words are found in a string of languages extending from Baltistan

SA 197 601 ST 197 601

and Kanawar in the northwest to the Garo Hills in the southeast, all exposed to direct Indian influence. The extent of borrowing in kinship nomenclature is in general correlated with the rate of borrowing in general, but this is not necessarily so, e.g. Magari has preserved a large proportion of its original TB vocabulary yet has retained only a single kinship term (za Ch), if we can trust our sources. The tendency to borrow terms for male kin rather than female kin has been observed in Balti, Kanauri, Newari (less well marked), Miri, and Barish. Terms for relatives older than speaker are also more likely to be borrowed than those for relatives younger than speaker. Probably both points can be explained on the basis of the honorific connotations associated with loan-words in general, which go to make up the "respectable" idiom as opposed to the vulgar. The term mama MB has been borrowed by Balti, Kanauri, Dhimal, Bodo, Garo, and perhaps Meithei, whereas the Indic FBi term has been borrowed only once (Dhimal).

The most prominent instances of borrowings made within Tibeto-Burman are those of Lepcha from Tibetan, and Atsi from Kachin. To illustrate the vagaries in the borrowing process, Atsi borrows its MB and FBi terms from Kachin but retains its native FB and MBi terms, whereas Byangsi (Almora group) borrows from Indic (Khasiya) its terms for FoB and FyB but employs a native term for MB. The borrowing of a term in a specialized sense only is exemplified by the following curious series: Kanauri mak-pa "Bi living in Fi's house" (from Tibetan); Lepcha kn-mok, id. (from Tibetan); Kachin

SA 197 601 ST 197 601 luk-k'i, id. (from Shan). All three languages have distinct Sl terms applied under normal conditions. Contrast Garo nok-rong "Sl living in Fl's house" (native term), cowari "Sl other than above" (from Indic); note that among the Garo the nok-rong is a formalized institution in a matrilineal society. It would be difficult to find a more ideal illustration of the mirroring of sociological features in linguistic phenomena.

Bibliography [1]

SA 113 ST 113

Bose, J. K.

1934. Dual Organisation in Assam. UCJDL 25, no. 8.

1937. Origin of Tri-clan and Marriage-classes in Assam. Man 37, Correspondence, 110.

Das, T. C.

1935. Kinship and Social Organization of the Purum Kukis of Manipur. UCJDL 28, no. 6.

Firth, R.

1930. Marriage and the Classificatory System of Relationship. JRAI LX. 235-68.

Gifford, E. W.

1940. A Problem in Kinship Terminology. AA 42. 190-94.

Hodson, T. C.

1925. Notes on the Marriage of Cousins in India. MI 5, nos. 3 and 4.

Hutchinson, R. H. S.

1906. An Account of the Chittagong Hill Tracts. Calcutta.

1 [For abbreviations, see this source in cat. 113, ALl Southeast Asia ALl -- Analyst]